

UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P O Box 1450 Alexandra, Virginia 22313-1450 www.weylo.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/566,741	01/31/2006	Giorgio Macor	11/2-22935/A/PCT	9743
324 JoAnn Villam	7590 12/17/200 izar	EXAMINER		
Ciba Corporat	ion/Patent Department	HORNING, JOEL G		
540 White Plains Road P.O. Box 2005			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
Tarrytown, N	Y 10591	1792		
			NOTIFICATION DATE	DELIVERY MODE
			12/17/2000	ELECTRONIC

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Notice of the Office communication was sent electronically on above-indicated "Notification Date" to the following e-mail address(es):

andrea.dececchis@ciba.com deborah.pinori@ciba.com sonny.nkansa@basf.com

Advisory Action Before the Filing of an Appeal Brief

Application No.	Applicant(s)		
10/566,741	MACOR ET AL.		
Examiner	Art Unit		
JOEL G. HORNING	1792		

	JOEL G. HORNING	1792					
The MAILING DATE of this communication appe	ars on the cover sheet with the o	correspondence add	ress				
THE REPLY FILED 07 December 2009 FAILS TO PLACE THIS	APPLICATION IN CONDITION F	OR ALLOWANCE.					
 M The reply was filed after a final rejection, but prior to or on application, applicant must timely file one of the following application in condition for allowance; (2) a Notice of Appe for Continued Examination (RCE) in compliance with 37 C periods: 	replies: (1) an amendment, affidavi eal (with appeal fee) in compliance	t, or other evidence, w with 37 CFR 41.31; or	hich places the (3) a Request				
The period for reply expiresmonths from the mailing.	date of the final rejection.						
The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this Advisory Action, or (2) the date set forth in the final rejection, whichever is later. In ne event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of the final rejection. Examiner Note: if box 1 is checked, check either box (a) or (b), ONLY CHECK BOX (b) WHEN THE RTR FERLY WAS FILED WITHIN TWO							
MONTHS OF THE FINAL REJECTION. See MPEP 706.07(MONTHS OF THE FINAL REJECTION. See MPEP 706.07(f). ions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The date on which the petition under 37 CFR 1.136(a) and the appropriate extension fee						
have been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of ext under 37 CFF 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of the set forth in (0) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Office later may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).	ension and the corresponding amount of hortened statutory period for reply origing than three months after the mailing date	of the fee. The appropria nally set in the final Office	ate extension fee e action; or (2) as				
NOTICE OF APPEAL	F	The state of the state of the state of					
 The Notice of Appeal was filed on A brief in comp filing the Notice of Appeal (37 CFR 41.37(a)), or any exter Notice of Appeal has been filed, any reply must be filed w 	sion thereof (37 CFR 41.37(e)), to	avoid dismissal of the					
AMENDMENTS	the state of the s						
 The proposed amendment(s) filed after a final rejection, t (a) They raise new issues that would require further cor (b) They raise the issue of new matter (see NOTE belo 	nsideration and/or search (see NOT		cause				
(c) They are not deemed to place the application in better form for appeal by materially reducing or simplifying the issues for appeal; and/or							
	(d) They present additional claims without canceling a corresponding number of finally rejected claims.						
NOTE: <u>See Continuation Sheet</u> . (See 37 CFR 1.1 4. The amendments are not in compliance with 37 CFR 1.12							
The amendments are not in compliance with 37 CFR 1.121. See attached Notice of Non-Compliant Amendment (PTOL-324).							
 Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejection(s): Newly proposed or amended claim(s) would be all 		imals filed amandmar	ot concelled the				
non-allowable claim(s).		•					
7. For purposes of appeal, the proposed amendment(s): a) how the new or amended claims would be rejected is prov. The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows:		be entered and an e	xplanation of				
Claim(s) allowed:							
Claim(s) objected to: Claim(s) rejected: 1-15 and 21.							
Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration: 19 and 20.							
AFFIDAVIT OR OTHER EVIDENCE							
 The affidavit or other evidence filed after a final action, bu because applicant failed to provide a showing of good and was not earlier presented. See 37 CFR 1.116(e). 							
 The affidavit or other evidence filed after the date of filing entered because the affidavit or other evidence failed to o showing a good and sufficient reasons why it is necessary 	vercome <u>all</u> rejections under appea	l and/or appellant fail:	s to provide a				
10. ☐ The affidavit or other evidence is entered. An explanation REQUEST FOR RECONSIDERATION/OTHER							
The request for reconsideration has been considered bu See Continuation Sheet.	does NOT place the application in	condition for allowan	ce because:				
12. ☑ Note the attached Information <i>Disclosure Statement</i> (s). (PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s). <u>05-01-2006</u>							
13. Other:							
/Michael Cleveland/ Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 1792	/J. G. H./ Examiner, Art Unit 1792						

U.S. Patent and Trademark Office

Continuation of 3. NOTE: Applicant has amended claim 1 to recite new limitations which were not previously required, determining the patentability of these limitations would require further search and consideration.

Continuation of 11, does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because: Applicant's arguments are directed towards the new limitations, which have not been entered. Regarding applicant's argument that Lin et al does not desire strongly adhering layers, as was discussed in the response to arguments in the final office action, it is desirable for such lithography processes to have well adhering layers so imaging will be successful, so it would be obvious to do so. Applicant's argument appears to be equating "strongly adhering" with "permanent," which, in the absence of a special definition in the specification stating this, the examiner disagrees with.